



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

signs of the spirit of the occasion should not be restricted to the international boundary, but should also find a place in the great centers of population, often far distant therefrom, thus carrying the message of mutual good will to the mass of both people.

It was urged before the subcommittee that an enduring monument in the shape of a memorial bridge be built across the Niagara River. This and other like projects appealed quite strongly to the subcommittee, but it felt that, involving as it does very large expenditures on the part of the governments of both countries, they might very properly be allowed to stand for further consideration until the respective committees shall have had greater opportunity to look more closely into these larger projects in accordance with the following resolution:

"This subcommittee recommends that after the American and Canadian committees shall have decided upon a plan of celebration regarding boundary monuments, memorials, and arches, a committee of six, composed of three members from each of the respective committees, shall be appointed, with instructions to consult experts in art, architecture, and engineering, with a view to the preparation of plans and the execution of the particular works to be undertaken."

## The Doom of War.

By Arthur Deerin Call.

The paradox of Christian civilization is its wars. The amazing wonder of human history is its incongruous spear-stickings and blood-lettings. But the distressing cost in wealth, the unhappy expense in terms of perverted judgments, the encouraging though slow evolution of a truer conception of life, the rise of effective peace agencies on every hand,—these not only make for an improvement in an intolerable world situation, they foreshadow the inevitable doom of international wars. Let us look briefly at each of these four factors.

### I.

#### THE COST IN MONEY.

We may well pause and reiterate the meaning of war to us in terms of money. To fire one of our big navy guns once, for example, costs the equivalent of a respectable home. To fire it twice costs enough to meet every essential expense of a college education. To fire it three times costs the equivalent of a competent minister or school teacher's salary for over a decade.

The money spent for one battleship would build a thousand locomotives, or fit 75,000 persons for a trade, or build a fine macadam road from New York to Washington and thence on to Gettysburg, or erect two Congressional Libraries, or dredge the longed-for six-foot channel in the Mississippi River half way from St. Louis to St. Paul. The money spent in the construction of one battleship would erect a dozen Washington monuments, or float fifteen first-class vessels for our

merchant marine, or create an Appalachian Forest Reserve, with all that that would mean in terms of water and timber and soil; it would give a college education to 24,000 persons, or pay the entire expense of running the public schools of a city with 100,000 inhabitants for over a quarter of a century; it would much more than build three Washington Union Stations, or meet the pay-roll of the U. S. Government for six months, or run the entire diplomatic and consular service of the United States for four years, or support 8,000 college professors for one year at \$2,000 each.

Not including coal, ammunition, pistols, clothing, food, our latest battleships cost over \$16,000,000. Our navy bill alone this year (1913) calls for over \$150,000,000, and we are told that we need an additional quota of 3,000 officers and 6,000 men properly to man the ships we have. We have spent nearly two billions of dollars on our navy alone within the last thirty years. During the last decade we have spent upon warships one-half billion dollars more than France, one-half billion more than Germany, and one billion dollars more than Japan, and yet we are told that every "patriot" will subscribe to a larger and larger navy for fear of a possible increase in the navy budgets of France, Germany, or Japan. We have ten navy yards and eighteen navy stations, while the last Secretary of the Navy said that we need only three.

Our navy today is composed of 277 vessels, which includes 38\* battleships, 11 marine cruisers, 63 submarines, 28 torpedo-boats, and 54 destroyers, yet Congressman Hobson insists that our nation should be guided in its policy of additional battleship construction by adding the average annual additional construction in Germany to the average annual additional construction in Japan. In other words, Mr. Hobson's conception of an efficient naval program for the United States is the annual construction of four dreadnaughts and two battle cruisers, all on the astounding assumption that Germany and Japan only await the chance to open their guns on some vital portion of our national anatomy.

We have 32 13-inch guns in our navy, each capable of sending a 1100-pound shell 13 miles, firing three shells a minute. We have 52 14-inch guns in our navy, each capable of sending a 1400-pound shell 14 miles, firing three shells a minute. Each shot uses from 300 to 400 pounds of powder, and the great gun, which deteriorates rapidly with use, costs approximately \$50,000. But the significant fact is that no nation save England has a potential navy power as great as ours. Our pension appropriation bill for the present year is considerably over \$180,000,000. Since the Civil War pensions alone have cost us over four billions of dollars. With the money spent for war in this country we could keep one and one-half million students in college. For every dollar spent for education in the United States \$1.25 is spent because of war.

Within the last thirty-five years our army, navy, and pension bills aggregate nearly fifteen billion dollars,

\* Number 39 has just been started. It is to be the largest yet, 31,400 tons displacement, 600 feet long, and with twelve 14-inch guns.

which is fifteen times the total value of all school properties in the United States. A little over 20 per cent of this has been spent upon the army, nearly 12 per cent upon the navy, over 28 per cent upon pensions, and nearly 11 per cent in interest. Exclusive of pensions, the United States is spending on its army and navy a larger percentage than any other nation of the world except Germany. Since 1872 our army and navy bill has increased 331 per cent, which is far in excess of any other nation's increase save Germany.

For running our Government each Congress is now appropriating fifty-four and one-half million over two billion dollars. This means that every man, woman, and child pays over \$10 each year for the upkeep of our national machinery. Upon the most conservative basis, 60 per cent of our national expenditures are because of war. This means that every person in our country sufficiently dignified to be counted in the United States Census is paying \$6 for war each year—an average of \$30 annually for the average family of five, a no insignificant part of the average income of the American family.

The figures for the world at large are equally staggering. The world's bank credits are \$34,000,000,000. Of these bank credits \$17,000,000,000 are in the United States. The world's net annual war expense is four billion dollars, nearly one-eighth of its bank credits, nearly one-fourth of the bank credits in the United States, a sum nearly three times the total value of the manufactured exports of the United States in 1912, a sum equaling that of all the imports and exports of the United States in 1912, the equivalent in dollars each year to ten Panama canals. And, adapting the language of England's first Lord of the Admiralty, Mr. Winston Spencer Churchill, what a wasteful, purposeless, futile folly it all is—what a stupid, unnatural chapter in the history of human endeavor! Surely the mere cost of war in money presages its doom.

## II.

### COST OF WAR IN PERVERTED JUDGMENTS.

Let us view war in its relation to the twisted judgments of men. We are told, for example, that all this expense is necessary as an "insurance" against war—that this money is simply a "premium" for the maintenance of peace. Nothing is more absurd. Any insurance is a contract by the terms of which a first party agrees to pay a second party a certain specified small amount, called the premium, for which the second party agrees to pay the first party a much larger sum in case of a contingency nominated in the agreement. We have had in thirty years one foreign war, and, by most careful computation, this war cost in round numbers three hundred million dollars. During this same thirty years, exclusive of pensions, we have spent for military purposes almost exactly four billion dollars. On the theory of "insurance," this means that we have paid a "premium" thirteen times greater than the "loss," and we have paid the "loss" besides. What a perversion of

judgment is this argument of "insurance"! Furthermore, and much more to the point, one-third of this vast expenditure for thirty years would have extinguished our national interest-bearing debt.

Many people fail to see that an adequate navy does not depend upon the number of ships, but rather upon the equipment and the men behind the guns. They have not learned that navies do not prevent war—that Russia and Japan, for example, both had navies, yet went to war; that the Boers were not influenced by the English navy; neither was England's hand stayed from war by the fact that she had a navy. Both the United States and Spain had navies, and went to war largely because they did have navies. In 1866 Russia and Prussia were armed, yet went to war. In 1870 Germany and France were not restrained from applying the sword by the fact that they were both armed. In 1877 the same was true of Russia and Turkey. In 1904 Japan and Russia went to war because they were both armed. Three-fourths of the nations of the world have no navies at all and have no wars.

That the significance of these things is not more clearly recognized must be attributed to a perversion of human judgment.

Again, war is costly because it does not distinguish clearly between physical and moral heroism; because it takes men out of productive activities, and makes fewer, therefore, the veritable necessities of life. War is costly because of the loss to industry, the destruction of property, the crippling of beneficence, the scourge of disease, the ruin in terms of life, the injustice, the blood-red madness, the despotism and night following the fights of armies, and the general hell of war. In the United States Army the equivalent of eleven companies of infantry, more than a whole regiment, are constantly on sick report with venereal disease. Thus war is costly because it ignores the spirit of true freedom found only in him who ruleth his own spirit. War is costly because its magnificence, called "moonshine" by General Sherman, is over-emphasized. Our armies and navies rest on fear rather than reason. The huge armaments of the world are a cruel slander against civilization, a tribute to an utter lack of sincerity within and of any faith in the sincerity of others without. War is costly because it perverts the judgments and perspectives of men.

War is costly because it is demoralization; it is barbarous; as said by Emerson, it is "an epidemic of insanity"; or, as we read in Noah Worcester's "Solemn Review," "War is, in fact, a heathenish and savage custom, most malignant, most desolating, and most horrible, and the greatest delusion, the greatest curse that ever afflicted a guilty world." Thomas Jefferson called war "the greatest of human evils." Franklin's words to Sir Joseph Banks were: "There never was a good war or a bad peace." Washington wrote of war in 1785: "My first wish is to see this plague to mankind banished from the earth." Gladstone called war the "original sin of nations." John Fiske characterized war as an "intolerable nuisance," as a "criminal business save

when justified on the ground of self-defense." This ghastly institution, inherited out of savagery, must go the way of other human perversions, dueling, witchcraft, thumbikin, lynching, slavery, prize-fighting, and the rack.

### III.

#### THE GREAT FACT OF LIFE.

Let us look for a moment at war from its relation to the basic principle of life.

The great fact of life is that life exists primarily that there may be more life. Every tree-bud, every field-flower, every child sent to school, every teacher of children, every social worker of the world, every courtship and marriage, every law, institution, invention is an attestation of this great fact of life struggling to produce more life. Our every experience teaches this.

Most superficially seen, the past witnesses our earliest ancestors pursuing their long creep toward a fuller life, toward this ultimate conception, unable to use tools or fire, developing slowly the notion of family, frequently fighting literally tooth and nail, mere savages in the human scale. Thus they began—"savages." Then we find cunning creeping gradually into the ends of their fingers, rude tools extending the length of their arms, wild weapons expanding their powers of conquest, the families uniting into clans; no longer "savages," we say—still fighting, to be sure, but "barbarians." Later, clans multiply into cities, the efficiency of weapons increases, the spirit of competition grows stronger; men still live under the rule that might is right and wage war against each other, unpeopling the world by sword and feud, one year of peace for fourteen years of war—and we call that "civilization."

But our great principle of life began to lead men out of savagery, out of barbarism, out of mere civilization. A new hope beckoned them, a larger revelation. They saw themselves "members one of one another." They beheld themselves related, consciously or unconsciously, with each other around the globe. Their ideal, therefore, began to become the ideal of a universal solidarity. Under the prime principle of life the doctrine of strife gave way for them gradually, very gradually, but surely, to a creative belief in a great mutuality, in a limitless human interrelation and a world-wide co-operation.

So we of today learn more readily and convincingly of a world brotherhood. We believe increasingly that we needs must base our institutions upon this great fact of life—that life exists that there may be more life on the whole and in the long run, for of such we hold is the supreme teaching of Christianity. It is out of such that history slowly evolves for us a faith in a still more glorious march toward the world's "gleam"—toward a new "humanism" indeed, international, world-wide, and righteous. Life is that there may be more life. Wars are inconsistent with this most fundamental of all laws; hence wars are outlawed and foreordained to cease.

(To be continued.)

The October number of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* will have a generous report of the Twentieth International Peace Congress.

### Open Letter from Norman Angell.

The following letter, recently sent to the Boston *Herald* by Norman Angell, will be of interest to our readers:

"In his speech yesterday Colonel Roosevelt showed very clearly the great need, if our civilization is to endure and improve, for abiding by law—showed that even when we believe ourselves to be the victims of some grave injustice we must not take the law into our own hands and make ourselves judge and executioner, imposing our own view of the case by force and violence. Here are his words:

"This is a country in which the people set themselves with face like flint against anarchy. \* \* \* The flag I see here in this hall is the flag of my country and yours, and there is no room in this country for the red flag of anarchy. The evils that exist we correct in orderly fashion. We will not tolerate murders or assaults as a method of correcting them, whether perpetrated with dynamite or with a revolver, or with whatever form of activity the assassin adopts.

"If they tell us that lawlessness and brutal violence are to be pardoned because it is done in the name of a cause, we reply that we will not have any repetition of the Paris commune. The man who wishes to reorganize society shall not do it in a way to plunge us into a welter of chaos."

"I do not think I have ever heard a more emphatic statement of the case for law and order—which in international politics we call arbitration—as against force and anarchy—which in international politics is war.

"We must all be delighted at the statement that even when evils arise, even when some one does us an injury, we must correct them 'in orderly fashion,' and that lawlessness and violence are not to be pardoned because they are done in the name of a 'cause.' And if these principles are sound, surely the sacred cause of country, of patriotism, must not be sullied by lawlessness and brutal violence; that such things are great and firm enough to stand on justice, not on the 'methods of the Paris commune;' that if it is wrong for the citizen to be judge and executioner all in one, and decide his own case, still more wrong must it be to base the cause of his country on the savage principles which, as between individuals, make civilization impossible.

"With what stupefaction, therefore, immediately after the passage just quoted, does one read the following statement from the Colonel:

"I will never consent to arbitrate national questions of vital honor and national interests. What is more, I know my countrymen, and I know that they will not consent. Uncle Sam will never arbitrate a slap in the face, and in the last resort the navy is Uncle Sam's punch."

"But if each one of us says: 'I will not allow the court to decide in any difference concerning my interest or honor; I alone shall decide when I am insulted, and I shall use my gun when I consider that I am'—why, in that case what does the Colonel mean when he says that we should correct our wrongs in an orderly fashion, and 'not in a way to plunge us into a welter of chaos?' "It were to be wished that the Colonel would explain."